



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

diligently gathered from many and differing fields. It is impossible to discuss here his conclusions or evidence for lack of space.

We may however mention two points of special interest in connection with his treatment. To a considerable degree the author makes use of the analysis of tribal and confederation names as a clue in tracing inter-mixtures and unions. Thus *ma* as an element in such names suggests the fish-peoples, the original prehistoric population; *oua* suggests the bird-peoples, the civilizing "reds"; *so* suggests the late-coming snake-peoples, with their degenerating influences. While other writers have made use of similar analysis of tribal names in northern Africa, it is perhaps safe to say that no one has applied the method so widely and with better apparent result. Again the author presents at full length a series of curious tribal traditions, *Les legendes de Farang, roi de Gao*. In many respects these resemble tribal hero-tales in general. Here, however, they are assumed to have historical suggestiveness and are considered to portray in figurative expression actual conflicts between the victorious invading and the defeated resident populations. Admitting the validity of the above-mentioned detail of method, the results of thus considering these legends are startling. These two points in Desplagnes' method are deserving of careful consideration and weighing.

Much in the author's material well deserves mention, but space compels us to refer only to the significant and large contribution which he makes to archeology. Soudanese archeology has been a little-worked field. It proves to be quite rich and interesting. Desplagnes says: "The principal prehistoric monuments and archeological documents discovered in the western Soudan are:

- " 1. Camp-sites and workshops of the Stone Age.
- " 2. Neolithic instruments, arms, and tools.
- " 3. Lithic monuments; raised stones and anthropoid menhirs.
- " 4. Ancient sepulchres — tombs, funerary chambers, tumuli.
- " 5. Defensive walls, megalithic enclosures, sites of old historic towns.
- " 6. Cliff designs, Berber (Tafinagh) inscriptions, Arabic inscriptions, and relatively recent manuscripts."

FREDERICK STARR.

*Mayan Nomenclature*. By CHARLES P. BOWDITCH. Cambridge, Mass.: The University Press, 1906. 8°, 12 pp. Privately printed.

The object of this paper is to show that there is no excuse for the errors of nomenclature in relation to the terms of the Maya Calendar to which several writers of the first rank have committed themselves and to which they have persisted in adhering. It is first shown that in the sys-

tem of numeration applied to time, the terms are different from those used for counting everything except days, and since this system counts forward from a fixed day it is correctly called a calendar. The rest of the paper is taken up with a defense of Dr Seler's designations for these time periods or calendar terms, namely the *katun* =  $20 \times 360$  days, the *tun* = 360 days, and the *uinal* = 20 days. This defense is based on the oldest available authorities: Bishop Landa and the books of Chilán Balam. The latter, which hand down to us very old records and which must be considered authoritative on matters of this kind, contain the clearest evidence that the period of 20 times 360 days was called a *katun* and that the period of 360 days was called a *tun*. Moreover, no such period as an *ahaukatun* is mentioned in the books of Chilán Balam, and no justification can be found anywhere for applying this name to the period of  $20 \times 360$  days.

Brinton's translation of the books of Chilán Balam is responsible for giving life to the errors referred to. The *katuns* were distinguished in these chronicles as *katun 9 Ahau*, *katun 7 Ahau*, *katun 5 Ahau*, *katun 3 Ahau*, and so on according to the day Ahau with which the *katun* began; but the chroniclers were in the habit of using a kind of ellipsis, and for the sake of brevity wrote 9 Ahau, 7 Ahau, 5 Ahau, 3 Ahau, and so on, suppressing the word *katun* in each instance. Brinton's translation renders the expression as 9th Ahau, 7th Ahau, 5th Ahau, and so on, as though the period itself were called an Ahau. Ahau is the name of one of the twenty days, and is never used as the name of a period of time. Again, Brinton repeatedly translated such an expression as *hun pistun oxlahun ahau* as "the first year of the thirteenth Ahau," whereas it should read "tun 1 of [katun] 13 Ahau," the word *katun* being omitted as explained above. It was the same peculiarity of the text, which however is by no means obscure, that led Brinton to use the term "Ahau katun," although in reality no such term occurs in the book which he was translating.

The paper is one which ought to be read by all students who intend reading modern writings concerning the Mayas, in order to save themselves confusion in terminology. While treating of this subject one feels inclined to enter a protest against another usage which seems to have become general among Maya students. I refer to the practice of calling 4 Ahau 8 Cumhu "the normal date." There is no justification in English for this use of the word *normal*, which thus applied is used with an entirely new meaning. A word so perverted from its true meaning becomes impoverished and does but poor service at best. In

scientific discourse it is the practice to use words of exact meaning, and to restrict the use of each term. This habit on the part of the most eminent scientific writers in English gives to the scientific literature of the last half of the nineteenth century a dignity and charm that is not possessed by any other class of literature of the same period.

On page 2 of his pamphlet on the Temples of the Cross, etc., Mr Bowditch uses the word *normal* four times. At line 4 and at line 7 he uses the word correctly, since he follows regular English usage; but at line 12 and line 27, following a practice introduced by others, he uses it in a connection for which I can find no sanction either in scientific or in popular usage. Dr Seler, writing in his native German, is equally at fault. For English writers at least the word *prime* would seem to meet the demands of the case perfectly. We have *prime vertical*, *prime meridian*, *prime of the day* (meaning beginning of the day), *prime of the moon* (meaning the first appearance of the new moon), and many similar expressions, and if we were to apply the name "prime date" to 4 Ahau 8 Cumhu no violence would be done and we would have the sanction of correct scientific usage. Moreover the term would express the idea which we have in mind. Although it has not given rise to so many misunderstandings as the practices which Mr Bowditch justly condemns, this use of the word *normal* seems to be unfortunate, and it may be worth suggesting that the word *prime* be used instead.

The difficulty of avoiding errors in Mayan nomenclature might be illustrated by a curious instance in the paper under review. On page 4, third paragraph, line 6, we find the expression "Ahau 8," the word Ahau being used as though it were a time period, and the figure 8 as if it stood for a numerical count. At page 8 again we find the expression *hun piztun oxlahun ahau* translated "Tun 1 of Ahau 13," the 1 after Tun standing for a numerical count, while the 13 after Ahau stands for something quite different. Of course it is not what the author means, since he makes his meaning quite clear elsewhere; but this method of writing a date makes use of the word Ahau as if it were a period of time like Tun, a usage against which Mr Bowditch himself protests. The same mistake is repeated twice on page 10, where the phrase *uucpiztun uaxac ahau u kat-unil* is rendered "the Ahau 8, its katun." *Oxlahun Ahau* is 13 Ahau, and *uaxac Ahau* is 8 Ahau, and if we preserve the form of the original text in our English translation it will serve to indicate exactly what it stands for: a day name with its number attached.

G. B. GORDON.